

Docket AUS9-2001-0157-US1

Appl. No.: 09/875,955

Filed: June 7, 2001

**In the United States Patent and Trademark Office****RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

JUL 08 2004

**OFFICIAL**

In re the application of: )  
Maria Azua Himmel )  
Filed: 06/07/2001 )  
For: Method, Apparatus and )  
Computer Program Product )  
for Context-Sensitive )  
Scrolling )  
App.: 09/875,955 )  
Applicant's Docket: )  
AUS9-2001-0157-US1 )

Group Art Unit: 2173  
Examiner: Michael Roswell

**CERTIFICATE OF Facsimile Transmission**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to  
USPTO Group Art Unit 2173 at telephone number 703-872-9306 and to the attention  
of Examiner Michael Roswell on 7-8-2004.

Anthony V.S. England  
Anthony V.S. England

7-8-2004  
Date

**Interview Summary**

A telephone interview was conducted at 12 Noon Central Time on April 20, 2004.  
Attending were Examiner Roswell, Supervisor Bayed and Attorney England.

The primary reference relied upon in the rejection is a US patent to Bates et al.  
Coincidentally, Supervisor Bayed was the PE for that case. Bates concerns variable scroll rate.

Examiner Roswell indicated he views boundaries in Bates are like objects in the present case. I pointed out the presently claimed objects have tops and bottoms, unlike Bates's boundaries. I also pointed out that the passage of Bates the Examiner is relying on concerns calculating a boundary position within a current display window position for the purpose of determining rate of scrolling, and does not teach jumping the display window from one object in a document to another.

Docket AUS9-2001-0157-US1

Appl. No.: 09/875,955

Filed: June 7, 2001

Examiner Roswell was not able to point to specific language that states this in Bates, but he contended Bates teaches that boundaries can be defined at the top of each paragraph in a document so that scrolling would jump from one paragraph to the next. Agreement was not reached.

There was also discussion of the first Office action objection to the form of alternative claiming in the application. After the initial telcon, Attorney England found authority for the form of claiming that was objected to and called back and pointed it out to Examiner Bates, MPEP 2173.05(h). Examiner Roswell indicated that unless he called back, Attorney England could assume the rejection<sup>\*</sup> is withdrawn.

*\* ie the 35 USC 112, second paragraph rejection.*

Respectfully submitted,

*Anthony V S England*

Anthony V. S. England  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 35,129  
512-477-7165  
a@aengland.com